NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

THE PEOPLE,

C078129

Plaintiff and Respondent,

(Super. Ct. No. 12F05011)

v.

GREGORY LAMONT DORNERS,

Defendant and Appellant.

Appointed counsel for defendant Gregory Lamont Dorners has asked this court to review the record to determine whether there exist any arguable issues on appeal.

(People v. Wende (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a

disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

On February 4, 2012, defendant, an inmate at Folsom State Prison, was found in possession of 8.22 grams of marijuana.

Defendant pleaded no contest to possession of a controlled substance by a prisoner and admitted a prior strike. (Pen. Code, §§ 4573.6, 1170.12.)¹ The trial court imposed the stipulated four-year state prison term.

In December 2014, after the time to appeal his conviction had passed, defendant filed a petition for resentencing pursuant to section 1170.18, seeking redesignation of the drug possession offense from a felony to a misdemeanor. The trial court denied the petition because section 4573.6 had not been changed to a misdemeanor and therefore was not eligible for resentencing.

Defendant appeals from this denial.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

DISPOSITION

The trial court's order is affirmed.

		BUTZ	, J.
We concur:			
RAYE	, P. J.		
HULL	, J.		